



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/780,060 | 02/09/2001 | C. Neil Kitson | TDIG.P-001 | 9997 |
| 21121 | 7590 11/12/2002 | | | |
| OPPEDAHL AND LARSON LLP | | | EXAMINER | |
| P O BOX 5068 DILLON, CO 80435-5068 | | | LAMM, N | IARINA |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1616 | |
| | | DATE MAILED: 11/12/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/780,060 | KITSON ET AL. | | | | |
| , | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Marina Lamm | 1616 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control | ation. A proper reply to a | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I: ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | If extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply one to later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action: or | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mater | rially reducing or simplifying the | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE: | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | on(s): | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | parate, timely filed amendment | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>See</u> | reconsideration has been consideration Sheet. | dered but does NOT place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY to | o issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>10-13</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9 and 14-21</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 22-40. | | | | | | |
| 8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

The state of the s

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Kawada et al. reference teaches lamellar liquid crystals. As the applicant has pointed out, "liquid crystals" are not crystalline". See p. 2 of the Response After Final. Therefore, the Kawada reference meets the claimed limitation "an aqueous formulation of at least two lipids in a non-crystalline phase lamellar array". Further, the Applicant's arguments are directed as to whether these lamellar liquid crystals of Kawada et al. will form a crystalline lamellar phase upon application to the skin. In response, it is noted that this limitation is inherent in the prior art because the Kawada's compositions contain the same ingredients as the claimed compositions.

JOSE' G. DEES SUPERVISORY PATERY EXAMINER

1616